

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-10 were pending in this application. The Office Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated. The Office Action rejected claims 2-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable. Claims 1-10 have been amended. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment. No new matter has been entered.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 1-10 to correct grammatical and idiomatic errors and conform more closely to current U.S. practice. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claim 1 be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,805,803 to Birrell et al. (hereinafter Birrell). The Office Action alleges that Birrell teaches or suggests all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Birrell.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Applicants respectfully contend that Birrell fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations recited in each of claims 1 and 6.

Claim 1

The preamble of claim 1 recites an authentication method of a user who uses a business system and a commercial service system. Claim 1 recites sending a request for use of the commercial service system from a terminal that the user is using to the business system, when the user who logs in the business system uses the commercial service system. As recited in claim 1, the business system checks whether the user is authorized to use the commercial service system, and selects one password from a password list created prior to authentication and sends the password to the terminal. The terminal then sends the password to the commercial service system.

As recited in claim 1, the commercial service system compares the password with authentication information created prior to the authentication, permits login when the password and the authentication information match, and invalidates the password. Claim 1 recites that the authentication information includes a plurality of different passwords so that a plurality of users of the business system need only one authentication information to use the commercial service system.

Applicants' FIG. 1 is an illustration where a client communicates between a business system and a commercial service system by using a one-time password sent from the client to the commercial service system. In this example, prior to authentication the business system generates a password list and sends the password list to the commercial service system. The commercial service system then generates the authentication information including a plurality of different passwords from the password list. A plurality of users of the business system need only the one authentication information to use the commercial service system. (Applicants' specification: FIG. 1; Page 4, line 23 - Page 5, line 8)

After the commercial service system matches the password to the authentication information, the commercial service system invalidates the password. Applicants' FIG. 1 illustrates nullifying or invalidating the password by changing a use flag in the authentication information. Additionally, login authentication processing can be performed by multiple users of the business system to the one authentication information at the same time by allocating different

passwords (e.g., PW\_1 to PW\_N) to the multiple users in the authentication information. Applicants submit that these features recited in claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Birrell.

Birrell discloses a secure web computer system in which a client accesses an intranet via the Internet. In order to access resources on the intranet, the client first authenticates to a checker, such as by proving a username and password. Once authenticated, the checker issues the client a token. The client presents the token to the proxy along with the client's request for resources on the intranet. The proxy then validates the token. In Birrell, the proxy simply determines whether the token is valid in order to process the client's request for resources on the intranet. (Birrell: Abstract; Col. 4 lines 28-52).

In contrast to Birrell, claim 1 recites invalidating the password after determining whether the password and the authentication information match. However, Birrell simply teaches that the proxy validates the token in order to process the client's request. Applicants submit that validating the token in Birrell is different from the feature of invalidating the password as recited in claim 1. Thus, Birrell does not teach or suggest invalidating the password as recited in claim 1.

In light of the above, Applicants submit that all claimed elements, as recited in claim 1, are not taught or suggested by Birrell. Applicants thus submit that claim 1 is allowable over Birrell.

#### Claim 6

Applicants submit that independent claim 6 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 6 is also patentable for additional reasons.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejected claims 2-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell. The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of the corresponding claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Birrell.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicants submit that all of the claim limitations are not taught or suggest by Birrell.

Claims 2 and 3

Applicants would like to point out that claim 2 recites the features of the business system generating and sending the password list to the commercial service system and creating the authentication information. Furthermore, claim 3 recites the features of the commercial service system generating and sending the password list to the business system and creating the authentication information. Applicants submit that Birrell does not teach or suggest these claim limitations.

First, the Office Action focuses only on generating the password list using a random number as recited in claims 2 and 3. Applicants submit that the Office Action unduly dismisses the features recited in claims 2 and 3 of generating the password list and the authentication information and sending the password list between the business system and the commercial communication system.

As discussed previously, the password list and the authentication information recited in claim 1, from which claims 2 and 3 depend, is created prior to authentication. Additionally, the authentication information recited in claim 1 includes a plurality of different passwords so that a plurality of users of the business system need only one authentication information to use the commercial service system. As recited in claim 2, the business system generates the password list and the authentication information and sends the password list to the commercial service system. As recited in claim 3, the commercial service system generates the password list and the authentication information and sends the password list to the business system.

However, in Birrell, there is simply no mention of generating the password list and the authentication information as recited in claims 2 and 3 by the proxy and the checker. Additionally, there is no mention of sending the password list as recited in claims 2 and 3 between the proxy and the checker. Thus, Applicants submit that Birrell does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of claims 2 and 3. Applicants submit that claim 2 and 3 which depend from claim 1 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discusses above for the allowability of claim 1 and for at least the additional reasons discussed above for the allowability of claims 2 and 3.

Claims 4-5 and 7-10

Applicants submit that dependent claims 4-5 and 7-10 which depend from claims 1 and 6 respectively are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 6. Applicants further submit that claims 4-5 and 7-10 are also allowable for additional reasons.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Sean F. Parmenter

Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 650-326-2422  
SFP:sfp:am